

reduced. It indexes future benefit increases to the cost-of-living increases instead of wage growth.

There are only two ways to fix Social Security, either bring in more revenues or you reduce the amount going out. What we are suggesting is one way to bring in more revenues is real investments. It could be a CD at your local bank, or it could be a United States savings bond. Or it could be the kind of investments that are indexed to maximize safety over the long run in those investments. Everybody should start thinking, is there a way that I could invest money better than what the government is doing in terms of what they give me back in Social Security? Can I get a better rate of return on some of that money that would exceed the 1.1 percent return that we are expecting in the future on Social Security benefits? I think the answer is yes.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged and excited about a President that is suggesting that we hold the line on spending, a President that is suggesting that we pay down the debt, a President that is suggesting giving back some of this surplus and letting it stay in the pockets of the people that earned it.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and February 14 on account of medical reasons.

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of travel problems.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BIGGERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, February 14.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAUZIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCINNIS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STUMP, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 235. An act to provide for enhanced safety, public awareness, and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 14, 2001, at 10 a.m.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE REPORT

As required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, the following report is submitted:

U.S. CONGRESS,

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, January 24, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,

*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) mandates a review and report on the applicability to the legislative branch of federal law relating to terms and conditions of employment and access to public services and accommodations.

Pursuant to section 102(b)(2) of the CAA, which provides that the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall cause each such report to be printed in the Congressional Record and each report shall be referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction, the Board of Directors of

the Office of Compliance is pleased to transmit the enclosed report.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL,

*Chair of the Board of Directors.*

Enclosures.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Section 102(b) Report: Review and Report on the Applicability to the Legislative Branch of Federal Laws Relating to Terms and Conditions of Employment and Access to Public Services and Public Accommodations. Prepared by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance pursuant to section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. §1302(b), December 31, 2000.

#### SECTION 102(B) REPORT

Section 102(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA) lists the eleven laws that, "shall apply, as prescribed by this Act, to the legislative branch of the Federal Government."<sup>1</sup> Section 102(b) directs the Board of Directors (Board) of the Office of Compliance (Office) to: "review provisions of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees, and (B) access to public services and accommodations."

And, on the basis of this review, "[b]eginning on December 31, 1996, and every 2 years thereafter, the board shall report on (A) whether or to what degree the provisions described in paragraph (1) are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and (B) with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch."

#### I. Background

In December of 1996, the Board completed its first biennial report mandated under section 102(b) of the CAA (1996 Section 102(b) Report or 1996 Report).<sup>2</sup> In that Report the Board reviewed and analyzed the universe of federal law relating to labor, employment and public access, made initial recommendations, and set priorities for future reports. To conduct its analysis, the Board organized the provisions of federal law according to the kinds of entities to which they applied, and systematically analyzed whether and to

<sup>1</sup>The nine private-sector laws made applicable by the CAA are: the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. §201 et seq.) (FLSA), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000e et seq.) (Title VII), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.) (ADA), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. §621 et seq.) (ADEA), the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. §2611 et seq.) (FMLA), the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. §651 et seq.) (OSHA), the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 (29 U.S.C. §2001 et seq.) (EPPA), the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. §2101 et seq.) (WARN Act), and section 2 of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA). The two federal-sector laws made applicable by the CAA are: Chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code (relating to federal service labor-management relations) (Chapter 71), and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §701 et seq.). This report uses the term "CAA laws" to refer to these eleven laws.

<sup>2</sup>Section 102(b) Report: Review and Report of the Applicability to the Legislative Branch of Federal Law Relating to Terms and Conditions of Employment and Access to Public Services and Accommodations (Dec. 31, 1996).

what extent they were already applied to the legislative branch or whether the legislative branch was already covered by other comparable legislation. This analysis generated four comprehensive tables of laws which were categorized as: (1) provisions of law generally applicable in the private sector and/or in state and local government that also are already applicable to entities in the legislative branch, a category which included nine of the laws made applicable by the CAA; (2) provisions of law that apply only in the federal sector, a category which included the two exclusively federal-sector laws applied to the legislative branch by the CAA; (3) private-sector and/or state- and local-government provisions of law that do not apply in the legislative branch, but govern areas in which Congress has already applied to itself other, comparable provisions of law and; (4) private-sector laws which do not apply or have only very limited application in the legislative branch.

The Board then turned to its task of recommending which statutes should be applied to the legislative branch. In light of the large body of statutes that the Board had identified and reviewed, the Board determined that it could not make recommendations concerning every possible change in legislative-branch coverage. In setting its priorities for making recommendations from among the categories of statutes that the Board had identified for analysis and review, the Board sought to mirror the priorities of the CAA. Because legislative history suggested that the highest priority of the CAA was the application of private-sector protections to congressional employees where those employees had little or no protection, the Board focused its recommendations in its first report on applying the private-sector laws not currently applicable to the legislative branch.

The Board also determined in its 1996 Section 102(b) Report that, because of the CAA's focus on coverage of the Congress under private-sector laws, the Board's next priority should be to review the inapplicable provisions of the nine private-sector laws generally made applicable by the CAA. In December 1998 the Board set forth the results of that review in its second biennial report under Section 102(b) of the CAA (1998 Section 102(b) Report or 1998 Report).<sup>3</sup>

The 1998 Section 102(b) Report was divided into three parts. In Part I the Board reviewed laws enacted after the 1996 Section 102(b) Report, resubmitted the recommendations made in its 1996 Report, and made additional recommendations as to laws which should be made applicable to the legislative branch. In Part II the Board analyzed which provisions of the private-sector CAA laws do not apply to the legislative branch and recommended which should be made applicable. In Part III of the 1998 Report, although not required by section 102(b) of the CAA, the Board reviewed coverage of the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Government Printing Office (GPO) and the Library of Congress (the Library) under the laws made applicable by the CAA and made recommendations to Congress with respect to changing that coverage. The Board noted that the study mandated by Section 230 of the CAA which was submitted to Congress in 1996<sup>4</sup> did not include recommendations to

Congress with respect to coverage of these three instrumentalities.<sup>5</sup> The Board concluded that the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, which focused on omissions in coverage of the legislative branch under the laws generally made applicable by the CAA, provided the opportunity for the Board to make recommendations to Congress regarding coverage of GAO, GPO and the Library under those laws.<sup>6</sup> As discussed in Section IV.C below, the Board Members identified three principal options for Congress to consider but were divided in their recommendation as to which option was preferable.

In the preparation of this 2000 Section 102(b) Report, the third biennial report issued under section 102(b) of the CAA, the Board has reviewed new statutes or statutory amendments enacted after the Board's 1998 Section 102(b) Report was prepared. The Board has also reviewed the Section 102(b) reports issued in 1996 and 1998 and the analysis and recommendations contained therein.

## II. Review of laws enacted after the 1998 section 102(b) report

After reviewing all federal laws and amendments relating to terms and conditions of employment or access to public accommodations and services passed since October 1998, the Board concludes that there are no new provisions of law which should be made applicable to the legislative branch. As in the two previous Section 102(b) reports, the Board excluded from consideration those laws that, although employment-related, (1) are specific to narrow or specialized industries or types of employment not found in the legislative branch (e.g., employment in fire protection activities, or the armed forces); (2) established government programs of research, data collection, advocacy, or training, but do not establish correlative rights and responsibilities for employees and employers (e.g., statutes authorizing health care research); (3) authorize, but do not require, that employers provide benefits to employees, (e.g., so-called "cafeteria plans"); or (4) are not applicable to public sector employment (e.g., an amendment clarifying the treatment of stock options under the FLSA).

## III. 1996 Section 102(b) report

In preparation for the first Section 102(b) Report, as noted earlier, the Board reviewed the entire United States Code to identify laws and associated regulations of general application that relate to terms and conditions of employment or access to public services and accommodations. Noting the underlying priorities of the Act itself, the Board chose to focus its 1996 Report on the identified provisions of law generally applicable in the private sector for which there was no similar coverage in the legislative branch. The Board has reviewed the 1996 Section

102(b) Report and the recommendations contained therein, as well as the additional discussion of those recommendations found in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report.

The Board of Directors again submits the following recommendations which were made in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report and resubmitted in the 1998 Section 102 (b) Report:

"(A) Prohibition against discrimination on the basis of bankruptcy (11 U.S.C. §525). Section 525(a) provides that "a governmental unit" may not deny employment to, terminate the employment of, or discriminate with respect to employment against, a person that is or has been a debtor under the bankruptcy statutes. The provision currently does not apply to the legislative branch. For the reasons set forth in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report, the board has determined that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to the legislative branch.

"(B) Prohibition against discharge from employment by reason of garnishment (15 U.S.C. §1674(a)). Section 1674(a) prohibits discharge of any employee because his or her earnings "have been subject to garnishment for any one indebtedness." This section is limited to private employers, so it currently has no application to the legislative branch. For the reason set forth in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report, the Board has determined that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to the legislative branch.

"(C) Prohibition against discrimination on the basis of jury duty (28 U.S.C. §1875). Section 1875 provides that no employer shall discharge, threaten to discharge, intimidate, or coerce any permanent employee by reason of such employee's jury service, or the attendance or scheduled attendance in connection with such service, in any court of the United States. This section currently does not cover legislative-branch employment. For the reason set forth in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report, the Board has determined that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to the legislative branch.

"(D) Titles II and III of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §§2000a to 2000a-6, 2000b to 2000b-3). These titles prohibit discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin regarding the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of "any place of public accommodation" as defined in the Act. Although the CAA incorporated the protections of titles II and III of the ADA, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability with respect to access to public services and accommodations, it does not extend protection against discrimination based upon race, color, religion, or national origin with respect to access to such services and accommodations. For the reasons set forth in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report, the Board has determined that the rights and protections afforded by titles II and III of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against discrimination with respect to places of public accommodation should be applied to the legislative branch."

## IV. 1998 Section 102(b) report

### A. Part I of the 1998 report (new laws enacted and certain other inapplicable laws)

In the first part of the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board noted the enactment of two new employment laws and concluded that no further action was needed because substantial provisions of each had been made applicable to the legislative branch. Next, as

<sup>3</sup>Section 102(b) Report: Review and Report on the Applicability to the Legislative Branch of Federal Law Relating to Terms and Conditions of Employment and Access to Public Services and Accommodations (Dec. 31, 1998).

<sup>4</sup>Section 230 of the CAA mandated a study of the status of the application of the eleven CAA laws to

GAO, GPO and the Library to "evaluate whether the rights, protections and procedures, including administrative and judicial relief, applicable to [these instrumentalities] . . . are comprehensive and effective . . . includ[ing] recommendations for any improvements in regulations or legislation." Originally, the Administrative Conference of the United States was charged with carrying out the study and making recommendations, but when the Conference lost its funding, the responsibility for the study was transferred to the Board.

<sup>5</sup>Section 230 Study: Study of Laws, Regulations, and Procedures at The General Accounting Office, The Government Printing Office and The Library of Congress (December 1996) (Section 230 Study).

<sup>6</sup>The Board also found that resolution of existing uncertainty as to whether GAO, GPO and Library employees alleging violations of sections 204-207 of the CAA may use CAA procedures was an additional reason to include recommendations about coverage.

noted above, the Board discussed and resubmitted the recommendations made in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report. In addition, the Board made three new recommendations, one based upon further review and analysis of statutes discussed in the 1996 Section 102(b) Report and two others based upon experience gained by the Board in the administration and enforcement of the CAA.

The Board of Directors resubmits the three new recommendations made in Part I of the 1998 Section 102(b) Report:

“(1) Employee protection provisions of environmental protection statutes (15 U.S.C. § 2622; 33 U.S.C. § 1367; 42 U.S.C. §§ 300J-9(i), 5851, 6971, 7622, 9610). These provisions generally protect an employee from discrimination in employment because the employee commences proceedings under applicable statutes, testifies in any such proceeding, or assists or participates in any way in such a proceeding or in any other action to carry out the purposes of the statutes. For the reasons stated in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board believes that these provisions are applicable to the legislative branch. However, because it is possible to construe certain of these provisions as inapplicable, the Board has concluded that legislation should be adopted clarifying that the employee protection provisions in the environmental protection statutes apply to all entities within the legislative branch.

“(2) Employee “whistleblower” protection. Civil service law<sup>7</sup> provides broad protection to “whistleblowers” in the executive branch and at GAO and GPO, but these provisions do not apply otherwise in the legislative branch. Employees subject to these provisions are generally protected against retaliation for having disclosed any information the employee reasonably believes evidences a violation of law or regulation, gross mismanagement or abuse of authority, or substantial danger to public health or safety. The Office has continued to receive a number of inquiries from legislative branch employees concerned about protection against possible retaliation by an employing office for the disclosure of what the employee perceives to be such information. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board has determined that whistleblower protection comparable to that provided to executive branch employees under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8) should be provided to legislative branch employees.

“(3) Coverage of special-purpose study commissions. Certain special-purpose study commissions that include members appointed by Congress or by officers of Congressional instrumentalities are not expressly listed in section 101(9) of the CAA in the definition of “employing offices” covered under the CAA. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board recommends that Congress specifically state whether the CAA applies to special-purpose study commissions, both when it creates such commissions and for those already in existence.”

*B. Part II of the 1998 report (inapplicable private-sector provisions of CAA laws)*

In the second part of the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board considered the specific exceptions created by Congress from the nine private-sector laws made applicable by the CAA<sup>8</sup> and made a number of recommendations respecting the application of currently inapplicable provisions, “focusing on en-

forcement, the area in which Congress made the most significant departures from the private-sector provisions of the CAA laws”.<sup>9</sup> The Board noted that it intended that those recommendations “should further a central goal of the CAA to create parity with the private sector so that employers and employees in the legislative branch would experience the benefits and burdens as the rest of the nation’s citizens”.<sup>10</sup>

The Board of Directors has reviewed the 1998 Report and resubmits each of the following recommendations made in Part III of the 1998 Section 102(b) Report:

“(1) Authority to investigate and prosecute violations of § 207 of the Act, which prohibits intimidation and reprisal. Enforcement authority with respect to intimidation or reprisal is provided to the agencies that administer and enforce the CAA laws<sup>11</sup> in the private sector. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Report, the Board has concluded that the Congress should grant the Office the same authority to investigate and prosecute allegations of intimidation or reprisal as each implementing Executive Branch agency has in the private sector.

“(2) Authority to seek a restraining order in district court in case of imminent danger to health or safety. Section 215(b) of the CAA provides the remedy for a violation of the substantive provisions of the OSHA Act made applicable by the CAA. Among other things, the OSHA Act authorizes the Secretary of Labor to seek a temporary restraining order in district court in the case of imminent danger. The General Counsel of the Office, who enforces the OSHA Act provisions as made applicable by the CAA, has concluded that Section 215(b) of the CAA gives him the same standing to petition the district court for a temporary restraining order. However, it has been suggested that the language of section 215(b) does not clearly provide that authority. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board recommends that the CAA be amended to clarify that the General Counsel has the standing to seek a temporary restraining order in federal district court and that the court has jurisdiction to issue the order.

“(3) Record-keeping and notice-posting requirements. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board has concluded that the Office should be granted the authority to require that records be kept and notices posted in the same manner as required by the agencies that enforce the provisions of law made applicable by the CAA in the private sector.

“(4) Other enforcement authorities. For the reasons set forth in the 1998 Section 102(b) Report, the Board generally recommends that Congress grant the Office the remaining enforcement authorities that executive-branch agencies utilize to administer and enforce the provisions of law made applicable by the CAA in the private sector.”

*C. Part III of the 1998 report (options for coverage of the three instrumentalities)*

In the third part of the 1998 Report, the Board, building upon its extensive Section 230 Study, exhaustively re-examined the current coverage of GAO, GPO and the Library under the CAA laws, and identified and discussed three principal options for coverage of these instrumentalities:

“(A) CAA Option—Coverage under the CAA, including the authority of the Office of

Compliance as it administers and enforces the CAA. (The Board here took as its model the CAA as it would be modified by enactment of the recommendations made in Part II of its 1998 Report.)

“(B) Federal-Sector Option—Coverage under the statutory and regulatory regime that applies generally in the federal sector, including the authority of executive-branch agencies as they administer and enforce the laws in the federal sector.

“(C) Private-Sector Option—Coverage under the statutory and regulatory regimes that apply generally in the private sector, including the authority of the executive-branch agencies as they administer and enforce the laws in the private sector.”

The Board noted that other hybrid models could be developed or, it could “be possible to leave the ‘patchwork’ of coverages and exemptions currently in place at the three instrumentalities and fill serious gaps in coverage on a piecemeal basis.”<sup>12</sup>

The Board compared the three options against the current regimes at GAO, GPO and the Library, as well as against each other, and identified the significant effects of applying each option. The Board unanimously concluded that coverage under the private sector model was not the best of the options. However, the Board was divided as to which of the remaining options should be adopted. Two Board Members recommended that the three instrumentalities be covered under the CAA, with certain modifications, and two other Board Members recommended that the three instrumentalities be made fully subject to the laws and regulations generally applicable in the executive branch of the federal sector.<sup>13</sup>

A review of the analysis, discussion and recommendations contained in the Section 230 Study and Part III of the 1998 Section 102(b) Report demonstrates the complexity of the issues relating to coverage of GAO, GPO and the Library under the CAA laws. The current regime is an exceedingly complicated one, with differences evident both between and among instrumentalities and between and among the eleven CAA laws. Any proposals for changes in existing coverage must not only take into account the existing statutory regime, but also the practical effects of any recommended changes, as well as the mandates of the CAA, including Section 230. Indeed, the degree of the difficulties and challenges encountered in determining how the coverage of the instrumentalities might be modified is evidenced by the fact that after three years of study and experience, the Members of the Board in 1998 were unable to arrive at a consensus on the manner in which the CAA laws should be applied and enforced at GAO, GPO and the Library.

While the current Board Members are mindful of the institutional benefits of providing Congress with a clear recommendation as to coverage of the instrumentalities, the Board is of the view that further study and consideration of the questions presented is warranted in light of the complexity of the issues and the substantial impact that a

<sup>12</sup> 1998 Section 102(b) Report at 27.

<sup>13</sup> In December 1998, at the time the 1998 Section 102(b) Report issued, there were four Board members; the fifth Board member's term had expired and a new appointee had not yet been named. Since the issuance of the 1998 Report the terms of the four Board members who participated in that Report have expired. At present, the five-Member Board of Directors is again at its full complement; three Members were appointed in October 1999 and two Members were appointed in May 2000.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8).

<sup>8</sup> The private-sector laws made applicable by the CAA are listed in note 1, at page 1, above.

<sup>9</sup> 1998 Section 102(b) Report at 16.

<sup>10</sup> Id. At 17.

<sup>11</sup> The only exception is the WARN Act which has no such authorities.

modification would have on the instrumentalities and their employees.

The Board believes that Congress, and the instrumentalities and their employees, would derive greater benefit from a recommendation based upon further study, consideration and experience on the part of Board Members. Therefore, the Board has determined not to make any recommendations with respect to coverage of GAO, GPO and the Library under the CAA laws at this time.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethylpolysiloxane; Tolerance Exemption [OPP-301096; FRL-6762-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

813. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Interagency Guidelines Establishing Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information and Rescission of Year 2000 Standards for Safety and Soundness (RIN: 3064-AC39) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

814. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances; Delay of Effective Date [OPPTS-50638A; FRL-6769-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

815. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

816. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1510-AA81) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

817. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of the Treasury (RIN: 1550-AB43, 3209-AA15) received February 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Repayment of Student Loans: Delay of Effective Date (RIN: 3206-AJ12) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

819. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and

South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 991008273-0070-02; I.D. 011801B] received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

820. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Coastal Zone Management Act Federal Consistency Regulations [Docket No. 990723202-0338-02] (RIN: 0648-AM88) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

821. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Water Quality Standards; Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Correction [FRL-6941-1] (RIN: 2040-AC44) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

822. A letter from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting A Report Required By The Congressional Accountability Act Of 1995; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and House Administration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 36. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents (Rept. 107-1). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 559. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 1 Courthouse Way in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HILL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HOLT, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MATHE-SON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HOFFEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 560. A bill to establish an off-budget lockbox to strengthen Social Security and Medicare; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 561. A bill to establish the Bipartisan Commission on Election Reform to study and make recommendations on issues affecting the conduct and administration of elec-

tions in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 562. A bill to amend the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the deduction allowed for meal and entertainment expenses associated with the performing arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 565. A bill to prohibit States from imposing restrictions on the operation of motor vehicles providing limousine service between a place in a State and a place in another State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 566. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the prorating of Medicaid beneficiary contributions in the case of partial coverage of nursing facility services during a month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 567. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require Medicaid coverage of disabled children, and individuals who became disabled as children, without regard to income or assets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 568. A bill to assure equitable treatment of fertility and impotence in health care coverage under group health plans, health insurance coverage, and health plans under the Federal employees' health benefits program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 569. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare coverage of certain disabled individuals who have no health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THOMAS M. Davis of Virginia, Mr. FRANK, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 570. A bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization